

WATER QUALITY M E M O R A N D U M

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

January 2, 2004

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Dana Dean, P.E., Senior Reclamation Hydrologist

RE: 2003 Third Quarter Water Monitoring, Company, Willow Creek Mine,
C/007/0038, Task ID #1730

- 1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?** YES ☒ NO ☐
Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

- 2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.**
See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling due date

There is no commitment in the MRP to resample for baseline parameters.

- 3. Were all required parameters reported for each site?** YES ☒ NO ☐
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

- 4. Were irregularities found in the data?** YES ☒ NO ☐
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Site B3N had two parameters that fell outside of two standard deviations from the mean. Dissolved potassium (4.56 mg/l) was 2.16 standard deviations greater than the mean of 2.63 mg/l. Sulfate (268 mg/l) was 2.10 standard deviations greater than the mean of 152.93 mg/l.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1 st month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
2 nd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
3 rd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

All DMRs reported "no flow".

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES ☒ NO ☐

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

All DMRs reported "no flow".

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES ☐ NO ☒

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

All DMRs reported "no flow".

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

No actions are necessary at this time.